

CALFED PUBLIC WORKSHOP - December 4, 1995**Summary Notes for Blue Group**

Facilitator: Zach McReynolds
Recorder: Sharon Gross
Notetaker: Larry Rodriguez

The group was somewhat frustrated with having to work through the process of developing a boundary alternative. While some realized the necessity of the CALFED team having to develop the boundary alternative, the group participants did not see the usefulness of their work through that same process. The general consensus was that CALFED should present more viable alternatives that can be evaluated more specifically with respect to flow, population, and costs when those alternatives are developed.

The presentation of the minimum boundary alternative was problematic because it did not provide sufficient information on the formulation of the alternative. Considerable discussion took place to describe the process of developing the example alternative.

In general the group found the example minimum boundary alternative to be deficient and that a minimum alternative did not allow for development of a viable solution. The following deficiencies were cited by group participants:

- The alternative was not balanced, it did not offer an equitable solution.
- No actions were included to improve through Delta movement of water.
- While the alternative cited actions for managing flows and temperatures for the restoration of anadromous fish habitat it did not include other actions that should be conjunctively implemented, such as:
 - restoration and replenishment of spawning gravels,
 - restoration of channel configurations,
 - restoration of shoreline habitats,
 - modification of gravel mining practices, and
 - improvement of passage at upstream reservoirs.
- No actions were included which address system vulnerability and reliability in a significant fashion (i.e. levee maintenance programs).
- No actions were presented in this alternative or in the master list of all actions which directly address improvement of water quality for urban supplies.
- No actions were included which address demand management at existing or more aggressive levels.

The group conveyed several other themes related to the presentation of alternatives. There were several suggestions to incorporate a rating system for each of the actions selected for an alternative. In this way the group would be able to evaluate how well any action met the objectives of the alternative. A number of comments indicated that the group felt the boundary alternatives lacked precision. Other comments suggested that the "conflict resolution" approach to developing alternatives encouraged division and that a better approach would be to encompass a more equitable resolution. Some suggestions were made to develop the alternatives in a thematic approach.

There was considerable discussion in the afternoon session regarding the objectives of a minimum solution strategy. As a whole the group felt that the minimum program level for a viable solution strategy needed to be raised. The group suggested that in addition to the minimum objectives presented on page C-12 of the workshop handout several new objectives needed to be added. A revised list of objective is as follows:

- Winter-run salmon and Delta smelt are not in danger of extinction.
- Water supplies do not face regulatory uncertainties caused by take limits.
- Additional species are not listed as threatened or endangered.
- The solution principle for equity is satisfied (i.e. benefits are fairly distributed across the range of objectives).
- -NEW- The level of system vulnerability is not decreased beyond existing levels (i.e. levees are maintained to at least current levels of protection).
- -NEW- Water quality for urban, agricultural, and wildlife uses will be maintained or improved relative to existing levels.

In an attempt to develop a minimum alternative the group suggested a list of action as necessary for any minimum alternative. The level of implementation of these actions was subject to debate among group participants. The suggested actions are as follows:

- Screening of diversions, with priority given to diversions with the greatest impacts to fish populations.
- Increases in habitat restoration and maintenance including:
 - shallow water, low salinity habitats,
 - upland terrestrial habitats,
 - riparian and shoreline habitats, and
 - aquatic habitats.
- Reduce pollutant discharges to the Bay-Delta system through:
 - reduction of point and non-point sources of contamination, and
 - taking land out of production to reduce agricultural pollutants.
- Ensure efficient use of water through demand management practices and linkage between land use and water supply planning.
- Maintain existing levels of levee protection while modifying maintenance practices to improve habitat conditions associated with levees.

- Provide funding for research in the following areas:
 - criteria for protection of species and identification of impacts,
 - role of hatchery supplementation in reestablishing fisheries,
 - appropriate level of levee protection,
 - adaptive management and monitoring, and
 - linkage and support to other complimentary programs.
- Develop institutional mechanisms to more easily facilitate water transfers.
- Develop additional storage capabilities to enhance implementation of transfers through the Delta. Additional storage should be considered in the following order:
 - storage developed through reoperation of existing facilities,
 - conjunctive use facilities,
 - new off stream storage facilities, and
 - new on-stream storage facilities.
- Land use changes to reduce subsidence.
- Prevent introduction of nuisance species - ballast water.
- Develop Emergency response system.

Other actions were suggested by group participants, but those listed above represent the actions which were widely accepted by the group.